DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 396 896 RC 020 653

AUTHOR Barrett, Jon
TITLE Survey of Outdoor Activity Provision for Young Offenders and Young People at Risk. Report.
INSTITUTION Basecamp, Dumfries (Scotland).
PUB DATE 93
NOTE 21p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adventure Education; *At Risk Persons; *Delinquent Rehabilitation; *Delivery Systems; Foreign Countries; Individual Development; Juvenile Justice; National Surveys; *Outdoor Activities; Social Agencies; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS *United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

In the summer of 1992, a survey gathered information on the availability and the nature of outdoor adventure experiences and related activities for young offenders and youth at risk in the United Kingdom. Survey questionnaires were returned by 61 providers of such services and by 159 youth social work and custodial agencies identified as potential users of outdoor activities. Results indicate that only limited outdoor activity provision was available to young people in trouble or at risk. This provision was most commonly offered as a recreational or low-intensity group and personal development resource. There was little evidence of intensive personal development or therapeutic work through the use of outdoor activities. The most active providers were organizations working from bases in inner-city and other urban areas. A very small number of residential outdoor activity and development training centers were also active. Few providers specialized in work with youth at risk. Many youth social work and justice agencies made some use of outdoor activities in their work with troubled and at-risk youth, particularly those aged 13-17, but such efforts were limited due to cost constraints, safety concerns, and lack of information. Many youth social work agencies that used outdoor activities strongly emphasized group and personal development, but providers and users seldom collaborated in this developmental work. Both providers and users were heavily dependent on statutory and charitable funding sources to finance outdoor activity provision. Two appendixes include statistical results. (SV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 396 896

Report on
A Survey of Outdoor Activity Provision for Young Offenders and Young People at Risk

by Jon Barrett

Survey Conducted by Basecamp in August 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jon Barrett

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Basecamp, Marthrown of Mabie, Mabie Forest, Dumfries, Scotland, DG2 8HB

Copyright Basecamp 1993

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RC 020653

Survey of Outdoor Activity Provision for Young Offenders and Young People at Risk

Contents:

Background to the Survey 2

Terminology 2

Survey Aims 2

Survey Method 3

Providers' Survey- Summary of Findings 3

- Types of Organisations 3
- Size of Organisations 4
- Referral 4
- Type of Outdoor Activity Provision 4
- Personal Development 5
- Evaluation 5
- Funding 5
- Association 6

Users' Survey- Summary of Findings 6

- Types of Organisations 6
- Use of Outdoor Activities 6
- Personal Development 7
- Evaluation 7
- Funding 8

Conclusions 8

Additional Research 9

Appendix I: Providers' Survey- Statistical Results 10

Appendix II: Users' Survey- Statistical Results 15

Copyright Basecamp 1993

Survey of Outdoor Activity Provision for Young Offenders and Young People at Risk

Background to the Survey

In 1989, the Hunt Report 'In Search of Adventure' was published. In addition to providing a brief historical perspective on the development of outdoor and adventure education and offering recommendations for a strategy to extend and develop this work with young people, the report presented an overview of the adventurous outdoor experiences available to young people in the UK. In Chapter 8 (paragraphs 8.61 to 8.65) a small amount of provision for Young Offenders and Those at Risk was identified.

Since 1986, Basecamp has concentrated its resources on promoting personal development opportunities for young people in trouble and at risk through adventure experiences. We were encouraged that 'In Search of Adventure' found evidence of the value of this area of work, but concerned at the limited extent of available provision that was identified, particularly so at a time when statistics and the media present a picture of increasing disaffection amongst young people.

So in the summer of 1992, Basecamp carried out a survey to gather more information on the outdoor activity provision available to these young people in the UK. Initially conceived as an exercise to inform the future direction of our work at Basecamp, we realised early on the wider value of the survey and the information that it might reveal.

Our intention was to gain a 'snap-shot' of what provision is currently made to young people in trouble and at risk by outdoor activity provider organisations, and of what use is made of this provision by youth social work agencies working with these young people. Because we anticipated that some outdoor activity providers may have had reservations about answering some of our questions, particularly since Basecamp is itself a provider organisation, we gained the support of the National Association for Outdoor Education in conducting the survey.

Terminology

We have used the same terminology as the 'In Search of Adventure' report by referring to outdoor activity organisations as 'Providers' and client organisations as 'Users'. (We were aware that some Users run and staff their own outdoor activity programmes with no involvement from Provider organisations. Although these youth social work organisations could be considered to be 'providers' in their own right, because outdoor activities only form a small part of their overall work with young offenders and young people at risk, we included these in the User category.)

We have referred to our target group of young people throughout as 'young people at risk' regardless of the nature of their involvement with the care and justice systems.

Survey Aims

Our first aim was to gain an increased knowledge of the Providers who work with young people in trouble and at risk. We wished to know the various types of Provider organisations, their size and staffing, and the extent of their provision for these young people as part of their overall range of clients. We were interested also to find out about the nature of the outdoor experiences that they offer; the duration of their programmes, the types of activities provided, the emphasis placed upon personal development, and the extent of their involvement with User organisations.

We also set out to gain an overview of how this provision is taken up by Users. We wanted to know the range of types of youth social work and custodial agencies who use activities and the extent to which they use the facilities and resources offered by Providers. We also wanted to find out what outdoor activities are used in their work with young people, how these activities are used, and with what types of groups of young people.

For both User and Provider organisations, we were interested to discover the extent to which evaluation of this outdoor activity provision has taken place, and how the provision is funded.

Apart from this general overview, we also intended that the results of the survey might serve to guide some more extensive future research into the aims and applications of outdoor and adventurous activities with young people at risk and into the efficacy of this work in facilitating personal development.

Survey Method

We assembled a base list of over 400 outdoor activity Providers in the UK. From this list, we identified a total of 108 organisations to receive our survey questionnaire, selected on the basis that they may be undertaking at least a small amount of work with young people at risk. (We excluded those who clearly specialised in other areas of work; for example, in Outdoor Management Development, Field Studies or commercial Adventure Holidays).

We also sent questionnaires to 512 youth social work and custodial agencies whom we had identified as potential Users of outdoor activities. This sample was made up of a range of statutory and voluntary organisations from across the UK, and included Criminal Justice and Probation, Juvenile Justice and Intermediate Treatment, Alternatives to Custody, Residential Care, and Young Offender Institutions.

The responses to the survey questions were then written up as separate statistical analyses for both Provider and User categories. We included our own interpretation of these statistics in the form of comments added to the analyses.

Providers' Survey - Summary of Findings

Of the 108 Providers surveyed, 61 questionnaires were returned (approximately 56%). These returns came from Providers in all areas of the UK. Although we are not able to say conclusively that those who did not reply are not active with young people at risk, we feel from our working knowledge of the field that this is likely to be the case and that we received replies from the vast majority of those who are active in the UK.

Although very few Providers stated that they do no work at all with young people at risk, the overall amount of provision is very limited. Only 23 respondents undertake more than 30% of their overall annual provision with these young people. We termed these First Category Providers.

Because a number of these First Category Providers are separate bases of the same organisations, the actual number of First Category organisations is only 13. Of these, only 10 can be considered to specialise in that they apportion more than 50% of their annual provision to young people at risk.

The survey revealed 30 Providers who offer between 1%-30% of their annual provision to our target group of young people. We called these Second Category Providers.

The remaining 8 respondents stated that they do no work at all with young people at risk.

The survey results demonstrated some clear differences between First and Second Category Providers.

Types of Organisations:

The large majority (15) of First Category Providers operate from non-residential bases in inner-city or urban areas and offer provision to their local communities.

Only 4 residential outdoor activity and development training centres are included in the First Category. Each of these centres offers very different programmes and none can be considered to offer conventional 'outdoor activity packages'.

A further 3 First Category Providers are residential care organisations who offer outdoor programmes as part of their overall care provision.

The remaining First Category Provider is a development training agency combining residential periods and supported home-based work whose target group is primarily the young unemployed and only incidentally young people at risk.

Most (18) Second Category Providers are residential outdoor activity and development training centres to which young people travel to participate in programmes.

7 inner-city or urban based Providers are also included in the Second Category, as are 3 sail training providers, 1 residential care organisation, and 1 organisation operating overseas community-service or scientific expeditions.

These results indicate that the overall quantity of provision available in the UK is very limited with only a small number of organisations specialising in this work. The most active Providers are inner-city or urban based organisations and a few residential centres who clearly target their work with young people at risk.

Size of Organisations:

First Category Providers are mainly small organisations maintaining small staff teams. (An exception to this is one large organisation which operates from a number of separate small bases in the UK).

The majority of First Category Providers target their work with young people at risk by employing a staff member with specific responsibility for developing this work.

Most First Category Providers work with less than 200 young people per year. (The exception to this is the one large organisation, some of whose separate bases stated that they work with between 200-1000+ per year).

On average, Second Category Providers are larger organisations.

Less than a quarter of Second Category Providers employ a staff member with responsibility for developing work with young people at risk.

Almost two-thirds of Second Category Providers work with fewer than 100 young people at risk per year, the majority of these stating that they work with less than 50. The remaining Secondary Category Providers did not answer this question.

The most active Providers are usually small organisations who work with low numbers of young people at risk per year. Less active Providers tend to be larger organisations who work with very low numbers of young people at risk per year as a small proportion of their much larger overall client group.

Referral:

First Category Providers are generally flexible in accepting both group and individual referrals, and often involve care agency staff in programmes along with young people.

Second Category Providers are slightly less flexible, with less than two-thirds accepting group and individual referrals and the remainder accepting group or individual referrals only. Care agency staff are less commonly involved in their programmes, with half stating that they never involve care agency staff.

Type of Outdoor Activity Provision:

First Category Providers are flexible in the duration of programmes that they offer and commonly offer both day and residential programmes or programmes which combine these. Programmes vary in duration from 1 day to 22 weeks or on-going.

Over half of Second Category Providers offer residential programmes only. The duration of programmes offered ranges from 1 day to 3 weeks with an average length of 5-6 days.

There are no major differences in the types of outdoor activities offered by either category. The most common activity stated is Initiatives which indicates that these co-operative, group-building and problem-solving activities are emphasised equally by both categories.

Personal Development

All but one First Category Provider stated that developmental groupwork is undertaken as part of their outdoor activity programmes, the large majority of these stating throughout the programme. Most First Category Providers also undertake preparatory and follow-up work.

Developmental groupwork is much less heavily emphasised by Second Category Providers, and more than half stated that they do not undertake preparatory and follow-up work.

These results indicate that First Category Providers are generally more flexible in operation than Second Category Providers. In particular they are more flexible in the type of referral that they accept and in their involvement of care agency staff. Most First Category Providers, but only some Second Category Providers see their work as being directed at group and personal development rather than as a recreational provision only. Many First Category Providers do not confine this developmental work to the outdoor programme alone, but also offer preparatory and follow-up work.

Evaluation:

First Category Providers commonly carry out internal evaluations of their outdoor activity provision and often involve young people and their referring agencies in this evaluation.

Internal evaluation is less common amongst Second Category Providers of whom less than half ever undertake evaluations and almost half of these again only evaluating their provision internally with their own staff.

Very few Providers in either category indicated that evaluations have been carried out by external evaluators.

Funding:

More than half of First Category Providers stated that they fundraise to assist in financing their provision. Almost the same number again are dependent upon receiving some statutory funding.

Only 2 First Category Providers finance their entire provision for young people at risk through charging fees, and almost half charge no fees at all.

The majority of First Category Providers rely upon a combination of statutory funds, fundraising and fees.

Second Category Providers rely more heavily on fees with almost one third depending upon this income alone. However, another third charge no fees at all and depend upon statutory funds or their own fundraising or a combination of these.

For both categories of Provider, those that charge fees often have these met from statutory or charitable sources (ie. central or local government funds, national voluntary agencies or charitable trusts).

These results indicate that outdoor activity provision for young people at risk is frequently not financially viable without direct funding from statutory or charitable sources. Where fees are charged these are most often derived from the same sources. Given this dependence upon statutory and charitable funding, it is perhaps surprising that few objective external evaluations have been carried out.

Association:

The large majority of providers in both categories indicated their interest in joining an association to share experience and information about work with young people at risk.

Only 6 Providers stated that they had no interest in joining an association.

This result indicates a high level of interest amongst Providers, whether they are currently very active or not, to share information and develop practice in work with young people at risk.

Users' Survey - Summary of Findings

Out of 512 questionnaires sent out to Users, 159 were returned (approximately 31%). All areas of the UK were represented in the returns, as were all of the types of statutory and voluntary organisation that we had targeted. It is impossible to speculate whether those who failed to reply did so because they make little or no use of outdoor activities (or, if this is the case, whether this is because of a judgement made about their value, or due to lack of funds, or other reasons).

63 Users stated that they regularly use outdoor activities as part of their work with young people. We called these First Category Users.

77 stated that they sometimes use outdoor activities. We termed these Second Category Users.

The remaining 19 stated that they never use outdoor activities. (For the purposes of this survey, we have not examined their reasons for not using outdoor activities, but we have followed a number of these up with an additional questionnaire to help inform future research.)

Types of Organisation:

The largest number of returns (56) in both First and Second Categories came from Intermediate Treatment or Juvenile Justice agencies who work mainly with 13-17 year olds.

Very few (15) Probation or Criminal Justice agencies stated that they use outdoor activities, indicating that whilst some use is made with those aged 17 and over, this is very much less common than for the younger age group.

A high number of Young Offender Institutions (17) stated their use of outdoor activities, with over half using activities regularly. However this use is limited to those 17-21 year old young offenders who are able to leave the environs of their prisons on parole licences.

Other organisations in the First Category were 4 Residential Homes or Schools, 3 Special Needs Education Units, and 3 Community Youth Projects.

The Second Category included 3 Residential Homes or Schools, 7 Community Youth Projects and 1 Family Centre.

These results indicate that outdoor activities are most commonly used in work with young people between the ages of 13 and 17. Activities are much less commonly used with those aged 17 and upwards.

Use of Outdoor Activities:

Over half of First Category Users use outdoor activity residentials, with over one third using residentials regularly.

More than half of Second Category Users also use residentials, but only 12 stated that they undertake them regularly.

The organisations in both categories who use outdoor activity residentials regularly are predominantly Intermediate Treatment or Juvenile Justice agencies. Because these agencies tend to work intensively with relatively low numbers of young people per year, regular use can often mean only once or twice per year.

These results indicate that whilst the use of outdoor activities is quite common amongst User agencies, residential experiences are less common and take place mainly with the 13-17 year old age group.

The commonest activity used by both categories is hill-walking, suggesting that this activity is readily available in terms of staff and resources. The next most common is canoeing, suggesting that this is again a relatively accessible activity. Initiatives are less often used than most conventional outdoor activities that require qualified staff. This may indicate that Users are not commonly aware of their potential in facilitating group and personal development.

Over half of both categories of User collaborate with providers to staff outdoor activities. However a significant proportion in both categories use their own staff only.

The providers used by User organisations are not always Provider organisations. Sometimes paid or volunteer free-lance instructors are used. Provider organisations appear to be most frequently used to staff residential outdoor activity experiences.

Young Offender Institutions most commonly use their own staff only.

These results indicate that many Users make use of Provider organisations or individuals to staff outdoor activities, most often using a combination of their own and Providers' staff. However, it is not uncommon for Users to use their own staff only. In some cases, individual outdoor instructors are used as providers.

Personal Development:

Over three-quarters of Users in both categories stated that they undertake developmental groupwork as part of outdoor activities. The majority in each category undertake developmental groupwork regularly.

Several Users in both categories emphasised that developmental groupwork is the most important part of the overall outdoor activity experience.

Almost all First Category Users and more than two-thirds of Second Category Users also undertake preparatory and follow-up work. The large majority of Users stated that they undertake this preparatory and follow-up work with no involvement from outdoor activity Providers.

These results indicate that the use of outdoor activities to facilitate group and personal development with young people at risk is widely emphasised by Users. However, they also suggest that the extent of co-working between Users and Providers to facilitate group and personal development is very limited.

Evaluation:

All but 2 First Category Users stated that they evaluate their use of outdoor activities, with over two-thirds of these involving young people in the evaluation process.

The large majority of Second Category Users also carry out evaluations, most often with young people involved.

Less than a quarter of Users have had evaluations of their use of outdoor activities carried out by external organisations.

These results indicate that whilst evaluations are commonly carried out, few objective external evaluations have been undertaken.

Funding:

All User organisations stated that they fund their use of outdoor activities through statutory funds, fund-raising and grants, or a combination of these.

Over one-third of Users in both categories rely upon statutory funding only.

A smaller proportion of Users rely upon fundraising only.

These results indicate that the use made of outdoor activities by User organisations is wholly funded from statutory or charitable sources. This suggests that the great majority of Users have only limited funds available to finance their use of outdoor activities.

Conclusions

- Overall only limited outdoor activity provision is available to young people in trouble or at risk. This provision is most commonly offered as a recreational or a low-intensity group and personal development resource. Our survey found little evidence of intensive personal development or therapeutic work taking place through the use of outdoor activities.

- The most active Providers are organisations working from bases in inner-city and urban areas. A very small number of residential outdoor activity and development training centres are also active. Few Provider organisations can be considered to specialise in work with young people at risk.

- The most active Providers target their work with young people at risk. They tend to be flexible in operation, offering programmes of varying duration and content, accepting different types of referral, and commonly involving client agency staff. Groupwork processes and preparatory and follow-up work to facilitate group and personal development are generally emphasised by these Providers.

- Many youth social work and justice agencies make some use of outdoor activities in their work with young people in trouble or at risk. Many of these indicate that their use is limited owing to constraints of cost, safety concerns and lack of information on what is available.

- Youth social work agencies most often use outdoor activities in their work with young people aged between 13 and 17. The use of activities with those aged 17 and upwards is comparatively uncommon.

- Residentially based outdoor activity experiences are less common than day activities and take place mainly with 13-17 year olds.

- Youth social work agencies make some use of the provision offered by Provider organisations, but also often use their own resources and staff. Young Offender Institutions most commonly use their own staff and resources only.

- Many youth social work agencies who use outdoor activities strongly emphasise aims of facilitating group and personal development. Little collaboration takes place between Providers and Users in this developmental work.

- Internal evaluations are commonly carried out by active Providers and by Users, but very few external evaluations have taken place.

- Both Providers and Users are heavily dependent upon statutory and charitable funding sources to finance their outdoor activity provision.

- There is significant interest amongst Provider organisations, whether they are currently active or not, to share information and to develop practice in working with young people at risk.

Additional Research

In addition to the general overview that we hoped to gain from this survey, we also intended that the results would serve to guide some more detailed research into the applications and practice of outdoor adventure activities with young people at risk.

At the same time as conducting the survey, we commenced gathering information about outdoor adventure provision that exists outside of the UK, and also about developmental and rehabilitative initiatives taking place in the field of youth social work more generally. As part of this process, we selected a number of organisations who responded to our Provider and User survey and sent them a further questionnaire to gain a more detailed picture of their use of outdoor activities.

It is intended that this additional research will provide the basis for a further more intensive study into the various applications of outdoor adventure-based work with young people at risk and into what constitutes effective practice and methodology in using activities to facilitate personal development with these young people.

Appendix I: Providers' Survey - Statistical Results

Number of Questionnaires sent out: 108
Number of Questionnaires returned: 61

1/ TYPES OF PROVIDER ORGANISATION

Provider organisations undertaking more than 30% of their overall annual provision with young people at risk:

Residential Activity & Development Training Centres:	4
Urban Community-Based Outdoor Activity Providers:	15
Residential Care offering Outdoor Activity Programmes:	3
Other - (Drive For Youth):	1

Provider organisations undertaking less than 30% of their overall annual provision with young people at risk:

Residential Activity & Development Training Centres:	18
Urban Community-Based Outdoor Activity Providers:	7
Residential Care offering Outdoor Activity Programmes:	1
Sail Training Organisations:	3
Other - (Raleigh International):	1

Provider organisations undertaking no work with young people at risk:

Residential Activity & Development Training Centres:	8

Q - What proportion of your annual outdoor activity provision is provided for young people at risk?

First Category (More than 30%)	Second Category (Less than 30%)	Third Category (None at all)
23 (13)	30	8

Note: i/ From the First Category listing above, it appears that 23 Provider Organisations are represented. In fact only 13 organisations are represented. Two of these organisations operate from a number of bases in the UK. For the purposes of the survey, we have treated each base as a separate organisation.

ii/ Of these 13 Provider Organisations, only 10 apportion between 50%-100% of their overall annual provision to young people at risk. These Provider Organisations are listed at the end of the summary of results.

Comment: These results indicate that whilst most of the Providers we surveyed are active to some extent with young people at risk, very few of these can be considered to specialise in this work.

The large majority of First Category Providers are based in inner-city or urban areas and offer provision to their local communities. Most Second Category Providers are residential outdoor activity and development training centres (including sail training organisations) to which young people travel to participate in programmes.

Note: Only the replies of the First and Second Category respondents were collated further.

2/ SIZE OF ORGANISATION

Q - How many activity staff do you employ?

First Category	Second Category
Between 2 and 45 (Average of 5)	Between 4 and 60 (Average of 8)

Q - Do you have a staff member responsible for developing work with young people at risk?

First Category		Second Category	
Yes:	17	Yes:	7
No:	6	No:	23

Q - How many young people at risk do you work with annually?

First Category		Second Category	
Less than 50:	5	Less than 50:	15
50-200:	10	50-100:	4
200-500:	6	Unanswered:	11
1000+:	2		

Note: The 200-1000+ results in the First Category are stated by Providers offering day activity sessions as well as residentials.

Comment: The results show that First Category Providers on average maintain smaller staff teams than Second Category Providers, suggesting that they are generally smaller organisations. The majority of First Category Providers employ a staff member with specific responsibility for developing work with young people at risk, whilst less than a quarter of Second CategoryProviders do the same.

Most Providers in both categories stated that they work with relatively low numbers of young people at risk per year, indicating that the overall quantity of provision available in the UK is very limited.

3/ REFERRAL

Q - Do young people at risk attend as pre-formed groups, as individuals, or both?

First Category		Second Category	
Pre-formed groups only:	0	Pre-formed groups only:	7
Individuals only:	6	Individuals only:	5
Both:	17	Both:	18

Q - Are care agency staff involved in programmes?

First Category		Second Category	
Always:	10	Always:	9
Sometimes:	11	Sometimes:	6
Never:	2	Never:	15

Comment: These results indicate that First Category Providers are slightly more flexible than Second Category Providers in accepting both individual and group referrals. First Category Providers also involve care agency staff in their programmes more commonly than Second Category.

4/ TYPE OF OUTDOOR ACTIVITY PROVISION

Q - Do you provide outdoor activity residentials, or day sessions, or both?

First Category		Second Category	
Residentials only:	5	Residentials only:	15
Day Sessions only:	0	Day Sessions only:	1
Both:	18	Both:	14

Q - What duration are the outdoor activity programmes that you provide?

First Category	Second Category
Between 1 day and 22 weeks or on-going	Between 1 day and three weeks Average of 5-6 days

Note: Since there was great variety in the length of programmes stated by First Category Providers, it is not possible to determine an average duration.

Q - What outdoor activities do you provide?

Note: There were no marked differences between the activities provided by First or Second Category Providers, so the results were collated together.

Initiatives:	50	Rock-climbing:	45
Hill-Walking:	50	Abseiling:	44
Canoeing:	47	Orienteering:	38
Camping:	45	Sailing:	22

Comment: The results indicate that First Category Providers are generally flexible in the duration of programmes that they offer, whilst it is common for Second Category Providers to offer programmes of a fixed length. Half of the Second Category Providers offer residential programmes only. First Category Providers indicated greater flexibility by commonly offering both day and residential programmes.

There are no major differences in the types of activity offered by either category. The very common use of Initiatives suggests that these co-operative and group-building activities are equally emphasised by both categories.

5/ PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

Q - Does groupwork form a part of your outdoor activity programmes?

First Category		Second Category	
Throughout the programme:	18	Throughout the programme:	8
Sometimes:	4	Sometimes:	15
Not at all:	1	Not at all:	5
		Unanswered:	2

Q - Do you undertake preparatory and/or follow-up work with young people?

First Category		Second Category	
Always:	14	Always:	2
Sometimes:	6	Sometimes:	9
Never:	3	Never:	15
		Unanswered:	4

Comment: All but one First Category Provider stated that they undertake groupwork as part of their programmes, the large majority throughout the course of a programme. Groupwork is less heavily emphasised by Second Category Providers. Most First Category Providers also undertake preparatory or follow-up work with young people. This work is much less common amongst Second Category Providers.

This suggests that most First Category but only some Second Category Providers see their work with young people at risk as being directed at group and personal development rather than as a recreational provision only. Many First Category Providers indicated that this group and personal development work is not confined to the outdoor activity programme only, but also takes place before, during and after the outdoor activity experience.

6. EVALUATION

Q - Is any evaluation of your provision carried out?

First Category		Second Category	
Yes:	18	Yes:	14
No:	5	No:	14
		Unanswered:	2

Q - Who carries out this evaluation?

First Category		Second Category	
Your staff:	18	Your staff:	13
Young people:	11	Young people:	7
Referring agencies:	10	Referring agencies:	1
Outside organisations:	3	Outside organisations:	2

Comment: First Category Providers commonly carry out evaluations of their outdoor activity provision, with young people and referring agencies often involved in the evaluation. Evaluation is less frequent amongst Second Category Providers of whom less than half state that they undertake evaluations and almost half of these again only evaluating their own provision internally with their own staff.

Very few Providers in either category indicated that they have had evaluations carried out by outside organisations. This suggests that few objective external evaluations have been undertaken.

7/ FUNDING

Q- How is your outdoor activity provision funded?

First Category		Second Category	
Statutory funding only:	2	Statutory funding only:	3
Fundraising/Grants only:	2	Fundraising/Grants only:	4
Fees only:	2	Fees only:	9
Statutory funds & fundraising:	5	Statutory funds & fundraising:	3
Fundraising and fees:	8	Fundraising and fees:	8
Statutory funds, fundraising & fees:	4	Statutory funds, fundraising & fees:	3

Note: In many cases where Providers have indicated that fees are levied, these are charged to statutory agencies referring young people onto programmes. In other cases, fees are charged to care agencies who find these through their own fund-raising activities. The above results are therefore potentially misleading in not identifying that fees are often found from statutory or charitable sources.

Comment: More than half of the First Category Providers stated that they fundraise to assist in financing their provision. Almost the same number again are dependent upon receiving some statutory funding. Only 2 First Category Providers indicated that they are able to finance their entire provision through charging fees, and approximately half charge no fees at all.

Second Category Providers rely more heavily on fees with almost one third depending on this income alone. However another third charge no fees at all and depend upon statutory funds or their own fundraising or both of these.

These results suggest that such outdoor activity provision that exists for young people at risk is currently heavily reliant upon charitable fund-raising and central or local government funding, and that where fees are charged these are often derived from the same sources.

8/ ASSOCIATION

Q - Are you interested in joining an association to share experience and information about work with young people at risk?

First Category		Second Category	
Yes:	21	Yes:	24
No:	1	No:	5
Maybe:	1	Maybe:	1

Comment: This result indicates that there is a high level of interest amongst Providers, whether they are currently very active or not, to share information and develop practice in work with young people at risk.

9/ PROVIDERS APPORTIONING 50%-100% ANNUAL PROVISION TO YOUNG PEOPLE AT RISK

Basecamp
Corvedale Care
Fairbridge
Iona Community
Mobex
Runkerry - Dalriada Wing
TLC
Venture Scotland
Wallace House Cruise Challenge
West Coast Adventure

Appendix II: Users' Survey - Statistical Results

Number of Questionnaires sent out: 512
Number of Questionnaires returned: 159

1/ TYPES OF USER ORGANISATION

The information detailed in the results below was provided by the following organisations:

Organisations regularly using outdoor activities:

Intermediate Treatment/Juvenile Justice:	32
Probation/Criminal Justice:	11
Residential Care/Residential Schools:	4
Special Needs Education:	3
Community/Youth Projects:	3
Young Offender Institutions:	10

Organisations sometimes using outdoor activities:

Intermediate Treatment/Juvenile Justice:	24
Probation/Criminal Justice:	4
Residential Care/Residential Schools:	3
Community/Youth Projects:	7
Family Centres:	1
Young Offender Institutions:	7

Organisations never using outdoor activities:

Intermediate Treatment/Juvenile Justice:	4
Probation:	4
Residential Care:	4
Young Offender Institutions:	1
Drugs Projects:	3
Young Homeless Projects:	2
Psychotherapy for adolescents:	1

2/ USE OF OUTDOOR ACTIVITIES

Q - Do you use outdoor activities as part of your work with young offenders or young people at risk?

First Category (Regularly)	Second Category (Sometimes)	Third Category (Never)
63	77	19

Comment: The largest number of returns stating that outdoor activities are used regularly or sometimes came from Intermediate Treatment or Juvenile Justice agencies, indicating that this use is mainly directed at 13-17 year olds. Only 15 Probation or Criminal Justice agencies stated that they use outdoor activities, indicating that whilst some use is made with those aged 17+, this is less common than for the younger age group. However, a high number of Young Offender Institutions stated their use of outdoor activities, although this is restricted to those 17--21 year olds who are able to leave the environs of prisons on parole licences.

It is not possible to speculate whether those who failed to reply to the survey did so because they make little or no use of outdoor activities (or, if this is the case, whether this is because of a judgement made about their value or due to lack of funds).

Note: Only the replies of First and Second Category respondents were collated further.

Q - Do you use outdoor activity residentials?

First Category		Second Category	
Regularly:	21	Regularly:	12
Sometimes:	15	Sometimes:	28
Never:	27	Never:	37

Note: i/ Those in both categories stating that they use outdoor activity residentials regularly were predominantly Intermediate Treatment or Juvenile Justice agencies, but also included some Probation/Criminal Justice Agencies.

ii/ Because Intermediate Treatment and Juvenile Justice agencies tend to work intensively with relatively low numbers of young people per year, those stating that they use residentials regularly can often mean only once or twice per year. Therefore, the term ' regularly' should not be assumed to mean 'frequently'.

Comment: These results indicate that whilst the use of outdoor activities is quite common amongst User agencies, residential experiences are less common, being undertaken by only just over half of the Users in each category and mainly with the 13-17 year old age group.

Q - Who provides outdoor activities?

First Category		Second Category	
Your staff only:	18	Your staff only:	28
Outdoor providers only:	12	Outdoor providers only:	7
Both:	33	Both:	42

Note: i/ Many organisations stating 'Both' indicated that they use free-lance instructors (paid and voluntary).

ii/ YOI's most commonly use their own staff only.

iii/ For a list of Provider organisations identified by Users, see '6' below.

Comment: These results indicate that many care agencies use Provider organisations or individuals to staff outdoor activities, with over half in each category stating that they use a combination of their own and Providers' staff. However, it is not uncommon for agencies to use their own staff only.

In many cases, agencies stated that they use individual outdoor instructors as Providers, either as paid free-lancers or as volunteers. Provider organisations appear to be most frequently used to staff residential activity experiences.

Q - What outdoor activities are used? (The commonest outdoor activities, collated for both categories together, were as follows):

Hill -walking:	123	Rock-Climbing:	69
Canoeing:	99	Orienteering:	65
Camping:	73	Initiatives:	61
Abseiling:	72	Sailing:	44

Comment: The commonest activity used is hill-walking, suggesting this activity is readily available to Users in terms of staff and resources. The next most common is canoeing, suggesting again that this is a relatively accessible and available activity.

Initiatives are less often used than conventional outdoor activities that require qualified staff. This may indicate that Users are not commonly aware of the potential uses of Initiatives in facilitating group and personal development.

3/ PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

Q - Is groupwork undertaken as part of outdoor activities?

First Category		Second Category	
Always:	36	Always:	33
Sometimes:	13	Sometimes:	26
Never:	14	Never:	14

Note: Several First and Secondary Category Users who stated that they always undertake groupwork emphasised that the groupwork is the most important part of the overall activity experience.

Q - Does preparatory and/or follow-up work take place?

First Category		Second Category	
Yes:	61	Yes:	51
No:	2	No:	25
		Unanswered:	1

Q - Who undertakes this preparatory or follow-up work?

First Category		Second Category	
Your staff only:	57	Your staff only:	46
Outdoor providers only:	0	Outdoor providers only:	0
Both:	4	Both:	5

Comment: Over three-quarters of Users in both categories stated that they undertake groupwork as part of outdoor activities. Almost all First Category Users also undertake preparatory and/or follow-up work, as do more than two-thirds of Second Category Users. This suggests that the use of outdoor activities to facilitate group and personal development is widely emphasised. However, the large majority of Users in both categories stated that they undertake their preparatory and follow-up work with no involvement from outdoor activity Providers. This result suggests that the extent of co-working that takes place between Users and Providers is limited.

4/ EVALUATION

Q - Is any evaluation of your outdoor activity provision carried out?

First Category		Second Category	
Yes:	61	Yes:	67
No:	0	No:	8
Unanswered:	2	Unanswered:	2

Q - Who carries out this evaluation?

First Category		Second Category	
Your staff only:	17	Your staff only:	10
Young people only:	0	Young people only:	4
Both:	44	Both:	51
		Unanswered:	2

Q - Do outside organisations carry out evaluations?

First Category		Second Category	
Yes:	13	Yes:	14
No:	50	No:	61
		Unanswered:	2

Comment: All but 2 First Category Users stated that they evaluate their use of outdoor activities, with over two-thirds of these involving young people in the evaluation process. The large majority of Second Category Users also carry out evaluations, most often with young people involved. Whilst these results show that evaluations are commonly carried out, the survey did not determine the extent and nature of these evaluations.

The results indicate that it is not very common for outside agencies to carry out evaluations which suggests that few objective external evaluations have been undertaken.

5/ FUNDING

Q - How is your outdoor activity provision funded?

First Category		Second Category	
Statutory Funding only:	26	Statutory Funding only:	29
Fundraising/Grants only:	17	Fundraising/Grants only:	15
Both:	20	Both:	33

Comment: The results indicate that the use made of outdoor activities by Users organisations in both categories is wholly funded from statutory or charitable sources. Over one-third of Users in both categories rely upon statutory funding only. The remainder depend to some extent upon fund-raising and grants also. This suggests that the great majority of Users have only limited funds available to finance their use of outdoor activities.

6/ OUTDOOR ACTIVITY PROVIDERS IDENTIFIED BY USERS

Abercrave Outdoor Pursuits Centre
* Ackers Trust
* Ardeonaig Outdoor Centre
* Barcapel Christian Conference Centre
* Basecamp
* Bendrigg Lodge
Bushey Residential Centre
Campus Centres
Central Regional Community Education
Drake Fellowship (Sic)
Drumchapel Adventure Group
Duke of Edinburgh's Award
Easterhouse Sports Centre
* Endeavour (Scotland)
* Fairbridge
Grampian Region Outdoor Education
Haven Adventure
Loch Morlich Youth Hostel
National Sports Centre, Cumbrae
Nully Barge
* Ocean Youth Club
* Outdoor Access
* Outward Bound Aberdyfi
PGL
Raasay Centre
RAF Community Team
* Raleigh International
* Runkerry Centres
Royal Mail Residential Centre
Sailaway
* Sail Training Association
* Scottish Centres
* Scotquest
Sports Council
Strathclyde Park
Strathclyde Region Outdoor Centres
* TLC
Urban Outdoor Resource, Denny
* Venture Scotland
* West Coast Adventure
WMBC Youth Department
Wooler Outdoor Centre

* Included in our Survey of Providers.

7/ ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MADE BY USERS

- "....would like to use outdoor activities more, but time and cost are restrictive."
- "....outdoor activities are used to encourage young people to use local facilities."
- "....need access to non-residential activity centres."
- "....outdoor activities are an element of our groupwork programmes and not vice versa."
- "....we refer individuals to open centre programmes to avoid 'all offender ghettos'."
- "....we do not use outdoor activities because the Regional Guidelines are too restrictive."
- "....outdoor activities are used as part of an individual's programme rather than as a group activity."
- " ...our outdoor activities are limited because we only possess the bare minimum of equipment."
- "....a change of focus from diversion to intensive work has lessened our use of outdoor activities."
- "....we find it difficult to organise outdoor activities because of the nature of our clients' crimes and length of sentences."
- "....we lack information on what outdoor activities are available."